

**Interagency Land Tenure Subcommittee Meeting Notes**  
**6/22/06**  
**Bishop**

**Present:**

Inyo County: Ted Williams

Mono County: Scott Burns, Nate Greenberg

Inyo Nat Forest: Garry Oye, Dan Yarborough

BLM: Steve Nelson, Bill Dunkelberger

LADWP: Don McGhie

**The purpose of the meeting was to continue working on production of a land ownership adjustment opportunity database for Mono and northern Inyo counties, depicting current land ownership and all agency parcels potentially available for disposal. The purpose of the maps and accompanying database is to share information with agencies and the public as a tool to consider potential land adjustment actions. An underlying goal of this collaborative effort is to enhance opportunities to identify mutually beneficial, community supported land adjustment actions that should lead to better land use decisions.**

The City of Bishop was unable to send a representative today. The group reviewed last month's meeting notes and discussed the current status and next steps for the project. Inyo County has not yet finalized identification of its potential disposal parcels. Inyo County staff and Supervisors will be working on this over the next few months. The group agreed to move ahead with development and posting of the database with the caveat that Inyo County parcels would be added later.

Nate Greenberg discussed Mono County's willingness to complete the development of the database and host it on their website. Nate expressed the need for some funding from the participating agencies to offset Mono County's costs to implement this. Nate suggested that \$2,000 would enable Mono County to accomplish these tasks. The group agreed that each of the other four, primary agencies (USFS, Inyo County, BLM, and LADWP) would each contribute \$500. It was further agreed that Mono County will submit a bill to each agency for that amount along with the pertinent deliverables.

Each agency except the USFS still needs to revise its land ownership adjustment goals and constraints statements. Consensus from the last meeting was to use the following categories: (Land Ownership Adjustment) Mission, Needs, Constraints, Miscellaneous, and Contact Info.

**Please revise and email final approved copy to Nate Greenberg by 7/7/06 prior to next meeting.** (Drafts attached below.) This information will provide database users with critical background information on each agency's, unique land ownership adjustment programs.

The need for an introductory, explanatory document that provides an overview of the database and its purpose was discussed again. Everyone agreed that such a document was needed and should be a mandatory, introductory screen before accessing the database. Bill agreed to draft the document, largely from the purpose statement above and circulate for review with the goal of providing to Nate by 7/7.

The group then discussed the need to develop parcel specific data as appropriate to provide more detailed information about the status, constraints and other particulars of individual potential disposal parcels. **All agreed to provide the following parcel specific information to Nate by 8/1/06:**

- Disposal Status
  - Disposal In Process -or-
  - Available
- Disposal Status Description (if pertinent and non-confidential)
- Disposal Purpose (if pertinent & different from general agency info)
- Disposal Constraints (if pertinent & different from general agency info)
- General Notes (if pertinent & different from general agency info)
- Any special contact info if different from agency contact

The need for a disclaimer on all viewable and printable data fields was discussed. Subcommittee agreed that a statement such as: "Maps and database products are for informational purposes only. The data contained herein is simply an inventory of lands which each agency may consider disposing of, provided and updated voluntarily by each agency. None of the information on this website should be construed as official planning or decision documents."

**The next land tenure committee meeting was scheduled for July 20, 2-4 PM at the Mono County Administrative Offices in Mammoth Lakes. Meeting focus is to preview database framework and provide final input toward completion and posting on the web.**

*(The work products of this committee and all information from all agencies are strictly preliminary inventory data for information sharing purposes only. Map and database products are not to be construed as official planning documents or decision documents.)*

**Agency/Organization Land Tenure Mission, Land Tenure Needs, Constraints**

<b>Party</b>	<b>Mission</b>	<b>Needs</b>	<b>Constraints</b>	<b>Miscellaneous</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>
<b>BLM</b>	Dispose difficult, unmgable, low res value lands. Acquire mgble, hi res value lands. Provide land for cmtly purposes/expansion.	Increase efficiency of land mgmt.	Disposal of hi value lands, WSAs, ACECs, watershed wdl's (Cong/EO). Env. Constraints --- res value issues i.e. plants, cultural, etc.	Will only acquire from willing sellers only. Consider Ridgecrest FO BLM lands as an opp to improve the data base pool.	
<b>Inyo NF</b>	Interested in acquiring inholdings inside USFS lands. Multiple hi res value areas – prioritized. Desires to retain USFS lands/admin sites in cmties for employee housing.	Desires employees living in cmties on USFS admin sites. Ongoing land tenure process in Mono Cty/Mmth Lks.	\$\$\$\$. No complex land planng process. Nature of land tenure = difficult/complex. Counter to current administration view. Env. Constraints --- res value issues i.e. plants, cultural, etc.	Community needs can only be addressed by tenure if cmtly is within the USFS boundary.	
<b>Mono Cty</b>	Contain developments in/around cmties. Development directed by gen'l plan.	Seeks orderly cmtly expansion with decision making at cmtly level. Policies promoting agricultural lands, scenic areas, open space character = zoning policies.	Lack of infrastructure. Ltd land base. \$\$\$\$\$. Lengthy process. Willing sellers. Each cmtly has individual constraints because of unique character. Env. Constraints --- res value issues i.e. plants, cultural, etc.		
<b>LADWP</b>	<b>Watershed</b>	<b>Acquire lands and</b>	<b>Cannot sell</b>		

	<p><b>protection to improve water quality/quantity.</b></p>	<p><b>access around DWP facilities. Need access for ops and maintenance. Divest excess lands in and around towns. Divest/acquisitions of lands dependent on resource values.</b></p>	<p><b>water rts. Cannot sell ranches. Env. Constraints --- res value issues i.e. plants, cultural, etc. Priority for disposal based on compliance with 75 acres as per water agreement.</b></p>		
--	---	--	---	--	--

<b>Party</b>	<b>Mission</b>	<b>Needs</b>	<b>Constraints</b>	<b>Miscellaneous</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>
<b>Inyo Cty</b>	<b>Contain developments in/around cmties. Development directed by gen'l plan. Encourage development around existing cmties. Work with BLM/DWP re: land tenure.</b>	<b>Information of land tenure possibilities thru agencies, etc.</b>	<b>No net loss of pvt acreage. No mechanism to coordinate land trades. No 3 way land trade mechanism process. How to deal with new developments. DWP/IC water agreement ties up lands. Information regarding agency lands not readily available. Agencies may be competing for the same land. Env. Constraints -- - res value issues i.e. plants, cultural, etc.</b>		
<b>City of Bishop</b>	<b>Provide suitable housing, infrastructure, and employment for cnty.</b>	<b>Acquisition for growth. Wants to provide housing for various income groups from low to high, including senior citizens.</b>	<b>Env. Constraints -- - res value issues i.e. plants, cultural, etc. City bdies are confined. Gets the last scraps/rations ---have to wait until other agencies</b>		

			(cty, etc) act before they get anything.		